

Memorandum of Meeting
Working Group

Meeting Date: October 20, 2004
Time: 5:30 PM
Location: Modern Maturity Center

NEXT Working Group Meeting

Wednesday, March 23, 2005
5:30 PM Meeting
Modern Maturity Center
DuPont Ballroom
1121 Forrest Avenue, Dover DE

Community Working Group Members in Attendance:

Brian Belcher	Crossgates/Mayfair Resident
James Brown	Mayor, Town of Wyoming
Gerald Buckworth	34 th Representative District
Steve Cain	President, Crossgates/Mayfair Homeowner's Association
Zachary Carter	Director, Dover Parks and Recreation
Gloria Chappell	Lincoln Park Representative
Jane Edwards	Kesselring Property (East of New Burton Road)
James Galvin	Director, Dover Planning and Inspections
Steve Kitchen (for Darren Harmon)	Kraft Foods
Constance Holland	Director, Office of State Planning Coordination
James Hutchison	Executive Director, Central Delaware Chamber of Commerce
Frank King	President, Wyoming Mills Homeowner's Association
Rob McCleary	DeIDOT Representative
Milton Melendez	Department of Agriculture
Robert Mooney	Mayor, Town of Camden
Karen Walters (for Jack Papen)	Farmer, Major Property Owner
Randi Pawlowski	Dover First Seventh-Day Adventist Church
Michael Petit de Mange	Director of Planning Services, Kent County
Ann Rider	Crossgates/Mayfair Resident
Eugene Ruane	Dover City Councilman - 2 nd District
Robert Sadusky, Sr.	Dover City Councilman- 2 nd District
Deb Scheller	Eden Hill Farm
Janice Sibbald	Crossgates/Mayfair Resident
Stephen Speed	Mayor, City of Dover
Ali Stark	Holly Drive Resident
Donna Stone	32 nd Representative District
Donald Sylvester	President, Rodney Village Homeowner's Association
Doris Kesselring Taylor	Kesselring Property (West of New Burton Road)
Jeff Davis (for Craig Wearden)	Principal, W. Reilly Brown Elementary School
John Whitby	Kent County Motor Sales

Others in Attendance (Public):

John C. Andrade	Wyoming Resident
Chris Asaz	Carol Street Resident
Bill Edwards	Kennett Square, PA Resident
Claude Marks	Wyoming Mills Resident
Theresa Winchell	Charles Polk Road Resident

Others in Attendance (Project Team):

Jay Kelley	DeIDOT Project Manager
Gary Laing	DeIDOT
Andrew Bing	Kramer & Associates
Chris Fronheiser	DMJM+HARRIS
Gary Hullfish	DMJM+HARRIS
Mayuresh Khare	DMJM+HARRIS
Robert Kramer	Kramer & Associates
Evio Panichi	DMJM+HARRIS Project Manger
Marge Quinn	DMJM+HARRIS
Leslie Roche	DMJM+HARRIS
Ed Thomas	Kramer & Associates

The purpose of the meeting was to update Working Group members about a recent meeting with resource agencies, report to the Working Group about the feedback the team received on the conceptual alternatives from members of the Working Group, and provide the Working Group an opportunity to discuss the conceptual alternatives. Additionally, Working Group members were provided with information about DeIDOT's Travel Demand Model and how it will be used in the study, an overview of what the detailed studies will encompass, and next steps.

Bob Kramer of Kramer & Associates, the meeting facilitator, called the meeting to order at 5:50PM and welcomed those attending. Bob provided an overview of the agenda. Bob reminded Working Group members that they are one element of the study process and highlighted some of the resource agencies that DeIDOT must coordinate with and respond to as well, such as Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control, the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the Delaware State Historic Preservation Office, among others.

Resource Agency Meeting

- Jay Kelley, the DeIDOT Project Manager, welcomed Working Group members and noted that the Project Team recently met informally with the resource agencies and briefed them on the concepts and the pros and cons of each. Jay indicated that the study is making great progress with the Working Group and at this point in the project development process, the Project Team must begin formal coordination with the resource agencies. Jay noted that initiating the process with the agencies requires time and at this point the team can only tentatively schedule the next Working Group meeting.
- Leslie Roche, of DMJM+HARRIS, indicated that the agencies provided both general as well as specific comments to the Project Team. Leslie indicated that the agencies will be looking for connector ideas that avoid resources and if avoidance is not possible, then they will be looking for connector options that minimize impacts to natural resources. If this is not possible, mitigation measures must be identified.
- Leslie continued with information on the National Register listing of the Eden Hill Farm. The farmhouse was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1973. In addition to the Eden Hill farmhouse, there are other historic properties and buildings in the study area. The process to evaluate impacts to historic properties involves not only looking at direct impacts but also indirect impacts. The indirect assessment provides information on the impact to a property in a contextual way.
- Bob Kramer asked if the resource agencies were aware of the concerns of the Working Group. Leslie Roche responded that the Working Group process can come into play because of

community concerns. The federal process, which DelDOT must follow, allows communities a voice too. It does not mean they have a priority, but instead it requires the balancing of impacts and effects with the benefits that would be expected to happen if a transportation investment were made.

- Bob Kramer noted to the Working Group that the environmental process does not trump other issues but that these issues need to be balanced among the full range of issues facing a project.

Feedback from Working Group

- Bob Kramer noted that seventeen out of thirty-eight members of the Working Group provided feedback through the homework assignment on the likes and dislikes Working Group members had on the concepts. The Crossgates/Mayfair communities were well-represented in the response to the homework assignment.
- Bob Kramer noted that the feedback from the homework confirms the results of the break-out group exercise at the September 22nd meeting – that there is little or no support from the Working Group for Concepts 6, 8, 9 and 10.
- Chris Fronheiser of DMJM+HARRIS provided additional information about the feedback received from the homework assignment. Chris indicated that a Working Group member suggested overlaying the ideas contained in Concepts 3, 7C and the auxiliary connection in Concept 5. Chris noted that elements of this idea are in the other concepts.
- Chris also indicated that Working Group members offered ideas for other approaches to addressing study area transportation problems such as transit, ridesharing, and improved land use planning. Chris indicated that these ideas can be combined into a complementary strategy that can be pursued by the Delaware Transit Corporation, DelDOT, Kent County, and the City of Dover, the Town of Camden, and the Town of Wyoming under all concepts to include the No-Build.
- Chris indicated that based on the feedback received from Working Group members, there was a need to clarify the definition of the No-Build concept as some misconceptions were noted on the forms. The No-Build means no building of transportation improvements in the study area beyond committed transportation projects. It does not include intersection widening or widening of existing roadways as these are “build” improvements. The No-Build serves as a baseline against which other alternatives are compared and is required by law to be examined.
- As a result of the feedback received on the No-Build, Chris stated that the Project Team recommends a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) concept to be included in the analysis. Chris said the TSM concept would be minor improvements to poorly performing intersections (adding turn lanes, etc.), safety improvements and possible signalization. In the TSM concept, no new roadway is constructed.
- Chris then indicated that the team responded to all questions that were asked on the homework form and that the questions and responses can be found in Tab 3 of the notebook. Chris indicated there were a few common questions asked by many members and Chris wanted to highlight the answers now. Regarding an underpass, technically an underpass of the railroad can be provided at any location along New Burton Road, except in close proximity to Puncheon Run. Chris provided an overview of the advantages and disadvantages offered by an overpass and an underpass.
- Eugene Ruane asked if any of the concepts include an underpass, for example Concept 7?
- Chris responded that the structure can go over or under on this concept or any others. Eugene Ruane commented that the team may not have gotten correct feedback then. He noted that the team needs to take the advantages and disadvantages of under and overpasses to the public.

- Chris indicated that there were questions regarding the impact of the various Concepts on US 13. Chris indicated that the impacts to US 13 need to be examined and will be, once data are received from DelDOT's travel demand model.
- Chris indicated that there were questions about the number of homes that would need to be acquired under each concept. Chris noted that the concepts need to be refined into preliminary alternatives before this estimate can be made. The concepts will have impacts on residences and businesses in the study area.
- Chris said that the homework forms asked about DelDOT's process to acquire right-of-way. Chris reminded Working Group members that detailed information on this process is in Tab 3 of the notebook.
- Eugene Ruane asked if DelDOT had initiated right-of-way acquisition. Chris indicated that DelDOT has not as part of the West Dover Connector effort.
- Bob Kramer clarified that yes, the Department will possibly be purchasing lands immediately around the Eden Hill farmstead but that this would be for protection of the historic structure, not for a road. There are also discussions occurring about the possible purchase of the tree-lined allees on the farm.
- Evio Panichi, the DMJM+HARRIS Project Manager, then joined Chris to walk the Working Group through the likes and dislikes comments received on the homework forms from Working Group members. Bob Kramer urged the group to keep its focus on major omissions or issues that cause great concern with members.
- Evio presented the likes and dislikes about the No-Build (Concept 1) and Concept 2.
- Chris Fronheiser noted that there was a question regarding Concept 2C and its environmental impacts. Chris indicated that the environmental impact would be loss of vegetation, shading of the waterway and wetlands. Chris noted that all concepts that involve a new crossing of Puncheon Run would have this type of impact.
- Evio Panichi then presented an overview of the likes and dislikes received on Concepts 3 and 4. Chris Fronheiser indicated that there was a question regarding the travel volumes on US 13 and how they vary by time of day. Chris indicated that 70% of the traffic on US 13 moves northbound in the morning peak and it is simply reversed in the evening peak. Traffic flows are about 50% northbound and 50% southbound for the rest of the day.
- Gloria Chappell asked if the TSM Concept would address poor levels of service at intersections. Marge Quinn of DMJM+HARRIS responded that this concept would include intersection improvements that could help level of service at some intersections; however not all intersection performance in the study area can be addressed through the type of minimal improvements that are incorporated in a TSM approach.
- Eugene Ruane remarked about the positive feedback received on Concept 4. He asked if Concept 4 includes an enclosed pedestrian overpass? He noted the concept map did not note this treatment if it does. Gloria Chappell remarked that she thought it did or at least it could. Bob Kramer indicated that perhaps this issue should be struck from the likes and dislikes. Representative Stone reminded the Working Group of their ground rules which require respect for other's opinions. She indicated the comment should not be struck because a member had put it forth, so it should be considered in some fashion. Bob Kramer offered that perhaps the comment should be left in but countered with the negative – that there is a concern for student safety in crossing Webbs Lane. Eugene Ruane remarked that if this is the course taken, then these issues should be included on all Webbs Lane concepts. Bob Kramer closed the discussion on this issue noting that the project team would note the concerns on display boards used at the Public Workshop.
- Evio Panichi then presented an overview of the likes and dislikes received on Concept 5.

- Chris Fronheiser indicated that a question was received about whether or not this concept would improve traffic flow. Chris indicated that Concept 5 is expected to improve flow in the northern part of the study area. Mike Petit de Mange indicated that the spur through Brecknock Park should be considered a negative. Bob Kramer remarked that the agencies would be adamantly opposed to using parkland. Eugene Ruane noted that environmental justice issues should also extend to the apartment complexes on Webbs Lane in addition to Charles Polk Road. Bob Kramer indicated that this will be noted. Steve Cain noted that any option that includes Webbs Lane adds traffic to a poorly operating intersection^[LR1] under existing conditions and that this should be noted as a negative. Gloria Chappell responded that in that case the Webbs Lane concept is positive as it will provide an opportunity for intersection improvements along Webbs Lane. Brian Belcher asked why no connection to Wyoming Avenue was indicated as a negative. Bob Kramer indicated that some Working Group members thought this is where the majority of traffic wants to go (more northern destinations on US 13).
- Evio Panichi then presented an overview of the likes and dislikes received on Concept 6. Chris Fronheiser noted that very few comments ^[LR2]were received on Concept 6.
- Evio Panichi then presented an overview of the likes and dislikes received on Concept 7. Bob Kramer indicated that he heard questions about whether or not this was what the community wanted for the character of New Burton Road during the last Working Group meeting.
- Chris Fronheiser indicated that Concept 7 will enable the team and Working Group to compare the merits and disadvantages of improving New Burton Road to other concepts. James Galvin inquired as to whether or not comments like “relatively less residential impact” are correct? Bob Kramer suggested changing “relative” to “potential” in order to develop a range of impact issues. Bob also indicated that options can not be dropped until the team has more detailed information.
- Eugene Ruane asked relative to pedestrian and bicycle access, has the team determined which concepts would provide opportunities for connections? Bob Kramer responded that every alternative will have this review conducted and opportunities examined but that we do not have that information yet. Evio Panichi said that some treatments may not necessarily be along a roadway alignment but on a separate facility or pathway. Mike Petit de Mange indicated that this concept should also have the negative on the spur concept from the earlier discussion (across Brecknock Park). Ann Rider noted that she did not see a connection to Wyoming Mill Road and this could be a negative. Bob responded that it can be perceived to be a negative, and as we proceed, there is an ability to develop a new concept that includes favored elements of other concepts.
- Evio Panichi then presented an overview of the likes and dislikes received on Concept 8. Steve Cain indicated in his opinion it is not a positive to add traffic to Webbs Lane, so opportunities to address safety problems are not a benefit if a new road is proposed. Bob Kramer noted that the safety issues refer to a specific location in the concept. James Galvin noted that sensitivities are everywhere—all the concepts affect someone or something. Doris Kesselring noted that many concepts impact her farmland. She realizes that some impacts may be inevitable, but it is still an impact to her. Jane Edwards noted that if a concept allows for an improvement of an existing problem area, it is an opportunity, and thus a benefit. Bob Kramer summarized the discussion with an explanation of what the word consensus means, “I can live with it” —this does not mean you favor something or embrace an idea---only that you can accept it. He further went on to say that we have differing views on the Working Group. Everyone’s vested interests get discussed and there is a need to step down from predetermined viewpoints and negotiate. If the community can not agree, then that is fine, but then an opportunity to make an improvement may be missed. Working Group members must realize that the team and other Working Group members will present factual challenges to their own beliefs. This process necessitates that Working Group members listen to one another and be willing to seek and develop a balanced solution together. In the final result, it is a trade-off between impacts and benefits.

- Evio Panichi then presented an overview of the likes and dislikes received on Concept 9. Chris Fronheiser indicated that a question was asked on the homework form about how traffic on southbound New Burton Road would be encouraged to go past Wyoming Avenue and Webbs Lane to use this new connection to US 13. Chris indicated that traffic calming treatments could be added to Wyoming and Webbs Lane to discourage the amount of through traffic using these streets. The new connector road would not have direct driveway access and could have a higher speed limit than the other streets which could make it an attractive path to take. Jack Papen's representative asked if the connection to Wyoming Mill Road follows a property line? Chris indicated that the lines are conceptual only and not an actual alignment at this point. Donald Sylvester asked how is traffic benefited at Charles Polk Road and US 13 in this concept and others that connect there? Bob Kramer said without the travel demand modeling results it is not possible to say. The intersection-level traffic analysis results will indicate the needed improvements at intersections on US13.
- Evio Panichi then presented an overview of the likes and dislikes received on Concept 10. Zachery Carter stated that Concepts 8, 9 and 10 should say that no access to Schutte Park is a negative.
- Janice Sibbald made the point that the likes and dislikes and pros and cons did not show some sort of impact to the elementary school on Webbs Lane for Concepts 4 and 8.
- Bob Kramer reminded Working Group members that Tab 3 contains the question and answer results. If additional questions are raised, please forward them to the team and they can be addressed at the next meeting. Bob also reminded Working Group members that Tab 2 contains meeting minutes from the September Working Group meeting.

Discussion on Conceptual Alternatives

- Bob Kramer reminded the Working Group that the Public Workshop and agency consultation process may produce additional concepts. The Working Group has already indicated that Concepts 6, 8, 9 and 10 do not have a lot of merit for further study. The concepts supported by the Working Group include ideas using existing roadways like in Concept 7 as well as ideas that use a new roadway, like in Concept 5, and the pool of concepts includes those that are combinations of new and existing roadways.
- Bob asked the Working Group if they are comfortable with presenting the public a TSM Concept. Representative Stone asked if a formal motion was required. Bob indicated that no, he was only looking for a general agreement. There was a sense of general agreement to present the TSM Concept at the Public Workshop.
- Bob also asked for general agreement about the overlay concept – that it should not be a separate concept at this point, as elements of it are contained in other concepts. Eugene Ruane asked who suggested the overlay concept and Bob responded that a Working Group member did. Eugene Ruane asked if an auxiliary connection to Wyoming Mill Road was part of this study and Bob indicated it was. There was a sense of general agreement that the overlay concept did not have to proceed independently now.

Travel Demand Modeling

- Bob Kramer indicated that using DeIDOT's travel demand model to understand how traffic would work under the various concepts is an appropriate, initial degree of analysis and the results will be available at the next Working Group meeting. Subsequently, for the alternatives retained for detailed study, the team will do a very detailed, intersection level analysis of the alternatives.

- Mayuresh Khare, of DMJM+HARRIS, then explained the modeling process. Travel Demand Models are predictive tools that allow the team to compare concepts. The first step is to calibrate the model using existing traffic counts and then validate the model so that it can predict realistically, existing conditions in the study area. Using a flow chart, Mayuresh showed that the modeling process to be used in the West Dover Connector study is two-staged. The first stage is to screen all the concepts using the Travel Demand Model. For those alternatives retained for detailed study, the team will use an operational simulation model, called Synchro, to generate level of service information and information on delays.
- Mayuresh then showed a series of maps depicting travel flow patterns under existing conditions at Saulsbury Road (southbound), New Burton Road (southbound) and US 13 (southbound). Asked by Eugene Ruane what time of day is illustrated, Mayuresh responded that it is for a 24-hour period under existing conditions. Bob Kramer indicated that this section of Mayuresh's presentation was for the Working Group to obtain an illustrative view of what the Travel Demand Model can tell the team and the Working Group about how the concepts will function.

Overview of Detailed Studies

- Marge Quinn then provided an overview of what the detailed study process entails. Conceptual alternatives will be refined into alternatives, traffic studies will commence as well as environmental and cultural resource studies. The conceptual alternatives that are retained for detailed study will be refined in terms of intersection needs, bicycle and pedestrian treatments, typical sections, and refined order of magnitude costs. For the traffic study portion, DeIDOT's Travel Demand Model has been calibrated and validated for our study area. Using the volumes generated by the model and linking the output to our Synchro models, we can compare alternatives on measures of effectiveness.
- Leslie Roche then provided an overview of the environmental studies needed, using a flow chart and the cultural resource process, using another flow chart.

Next Steps

- Bob Kramer reminded the Working Group that the upcoming Public Workshop will be held on November 10, 2004 from 4 to 7 PM, here at the Modern Maturity Center. The team plans to share all the concepts, get the public's comments about the concepts and any new ones they might have. We also plan to show the public the traffic and environmental data we have now on the study area. Bob asked Working Group members to please attend and listen to the public at least for one hour during the workshop.
- Bob indicated that the team will be initiating formal consultation with the resource agencies as another next step.

Next Meeting

The next Working Group meeting will be held on **Wednesday, March 23, 2005 at 5:30PM**. It will be held in the **DuPont Ballroom** at **Modern Maturity Center at 5:30PM**. A light dinner will be provided at the meeting. The objectives of this meeting will be to review the results of the traffic analysis of the preliminary alternatives and the screening results.